



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/814,638	03/22/2001	Harold Mattice	403450	6291

7590 10/17/2006

Harold V. Stotland
Seyfarth Shaw
55 East Monroe Street, Suite 4200
Chicago, IL 60603-5803

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DAT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3714

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/814,638

Applicant(s)

MATTICE ET AL.

Examiner

Dat T. Nguyen

Art Unit

3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04/25/2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 04/25/2005 in which applicant responds to the claim rejections. Claims 1-36 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acres et al. (U.S. 5,820,459) in view of IEEE-1394: An Emerging Interconnection System for Future Simulations and Creating One Industry Standard for Manufactures of Electronic Games of Chance.

Acres et al. discloses a system and method for operating gaming devices. The system includes a plurality of gaming devices (22)(24)(26) connected to an associated floor controller (28) over a network. The floor controller(s) can be connected to a host computer (32). The floor controllers can be connected to the gaming machines via a daisy chain configuration as shown in figure 12. Furthermore, Acres discloses any other equivalent interconnection scheme can be used (Figures 1, 12, Column 1, lines 8-32, Column 2, line 59-Column 3, line 18, Column 6, lines 30-41, Column 7, lines 18-55,

Art Unit: 3714

Column 8, lines 33-43, Column 10, line 20-Column 11, line 20, Column 11, lines 44-54, Column 19, lines 1-64, and Claim 1).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the applicant's invention, to configure a gaming system as instantly claimed by re-configuring the system of Acres utilizing any equivalent interconnection scheme, such as that described in IEEE-1394: An Emerging Interconnection System for Future Simulations and desired by the North American Gaming Regulators Association in order to set an industry standard providing flexibility, component configuration, smoother installations, and reduced cost to integrate systems.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant alleges there is no motivation to combine the references. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Creating One Industry Standard for Manufactures of Electronic Games of Chance teaches motivation to combine the gaming system and method for operating gaming devices of Acres et al. with the interconnection system of IEEE-1394: An Emerging Interconnection System for Future Simulations in order to set an industry standard providing flexibility, component configuration, smoother installations, and reduced cost to integrate systems. Furthermore, IEEE-1394 discloses the use of its interconnection system in gaming applications. Finally, Acres et al. discloses the option of using "other high-speed networks."

5. Applicant alleges that the present invention differs fundamentally from the Acres et al. system in that it is directed to a system of a plurality of devices communicating with a host controller through a plurality of local controllers or nodes, wherein the

Art Unit: 3714

devices may be located in a single gaming machine. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The device of Acres et al. communicates with a host server which controls and monitors many devices that provide different functionality to the machine such as the card reader, player preferences, etc via data communication nodes (col. 21, line 18). Applicant further states that the devices being controlled are not gaming machines themselves, but parts of gaming machines, such as individual switches, lights and the like.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The individual devices being control may not be the gaming machine themselves, however when collected and housed together inside a machine they comprise a whole gaming machine with many different parts performing different functions.

6. Applicant alleges there is no motivation to combine because Acres et al. discloses system elements connected over an Ethernet network, which does not supply power. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Acres et al. discloses an Ethernet network as the exemplary embodiment, however Acres et al. also discloses the possibility of substituting a similar network in its place (col. 37, lines 55-57). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention that the network of IEEE-1394 would qualify as a similar high-speed network. Applicant further alleges that IEEE-1394 requires that a connected device be within 4.5meters of the bus socket. IEEE-1394, however, does not disclose any such limitation; it merely states that the 400Mbit/sec transfer speed can go 4.5 meters, however lower speeds can go much further. Furthermore, the devices can be connected in a daisy chain allowing a much further distance from the controller.

7. Applicant alleges that Acres et al. teaches away from device positioning restrictions in stating that "other high-speed networks such as wireless networks could be used in place" of an Ethernet network. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Acres et al. does not explicitly teach the preference of wireless networks over that of other network types. Furthermore, the restrictions on machine placement have been addressed above.

8. Applicant states that Acres et al. fails to provide an enabling disclosure for power terminals and common terminals. However, IEEE-1394 does provide the disclosure and there is sufficient motivation to combine the teachings of IEEE-1394 with Acres et al. in view of Creating One Industry Standard for Manufacturers of Electronic Games of Chance as discussed above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3714

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dat T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 5712722178. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John M. Hotaling can be reached on (571)272-4437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dat Nguyen


SCOTT JONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER